

Supplementum Sublatum :

John Tombes

H I S

S U P P L E M E N T

Or, Second Book

About Swearing,

Disproved, and made Void; and his abusing
the Scripture plainly manifested.

Against which the Truth of *Christ's words*
is vindicated and maintained.

In a few words briefly returned to him

From { *Richard Hubberthorne,*
And
Samuel Fisher.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Robert Wilson, at the Signe of the
Black Spread-Eagle and Wind-mill in
Martins le Grand, 1661.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

FROM THE
ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY
FUND

February 6, 1937

Printed for Robert Wilson, at the sign of the
Black Swan, St. Dunstons, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.
1937.

Supplementum Sublatum,

John Tombes *his Supplement, or second Book*
about Swearing disproved.

John Tombes, thy first part of speech in proof of the Lawfulness of Swearing, being (it seems) such an Adjective as could not well stand by it self against such as have answered it, without the supply of some other words to be joyned with it, thou hast added another part of speech, (for even this also is but a part of what thou sayst thou yet intendest to make upon that subject) as a little Supplement (so thou call it) to supply the defects of the former, which thou confessest did want *framing, method, and matter*. But when thou again reviewest this thy last Supplement, it will need little more condemnation than the words of thy own mouth. Therefore we shall say a little to thee, lest thou be wise in thy own conceit, if thou be unanswered altogether; and yet but a little, lest we should seem to be like thy self, in multiplying words without *method and matter*. The substance of thy book being answered already in a book called *One Antidote more against Swearing*, we shall speak to some passages in it relating to our selves.

As first, Thou sayst page 5. that the using of these speeches, *God knows, or I affirm before God, or God is our witness, or This we say in the presence of him that shall judge the quick and the dead*; as an appeal to God's contestation, is plain swearing; and that *Sam. Fister* swears in his book entituled *The Rusticks Alarm to the Rabbits*, p. 48. 61. insaying, *God knows, I affirm here before God and all men*; and so while we speak against all swearing, we practise some swearing.

Reply, It is made plain in that book entituled *One Antidote more against swearing*, that these are *no oaths*, and here again, that if they were oaths, it being very frequent with *Paul* (as *Hen. Den* saith) to use them, then that Apostle (whom ye justify therein) un-called to it, by or before a Magistrate, (which is the only swearing now disputed for) did swear as frequently, commonly, ordinarily, in his communications with the *Saints & Churches*, (among whom his credit was so good, that his word might at any time be taken without an

oath) and consequently as *unnecessarily* as other men, which do use frequent, ordinary, and *unnecessary* swearing, which both *J. Tombes*, *Hen. Den*, and *Jer. Ives* do unanimously disallow; and so ye are guilty of egregious partiality, condemning in some the things which ye allow in others.

Moreover, if those be *Oaths*, how is it that the *Judges* and *Justices* in Sessions will not own them as so, and set free those prisoners when they offer to say *God knows*, *God is witness*, &c. that we intend no other but good, peaceableness, faithfulness and truth to the *King*, and *all men*; &c? Surely the *Magistrates* in *England* do not believe the *Priests* doctrine, for if they did, they would practise it; so that we may conclude, That they do but bear the *Ayr*, and spend their strength for nought, when both *Magistrates* and people will neither believe nor practise that for truth, which their *Priests* deliver for doctrine.

And whereas *J. Tombes* saith in p. 5. *That those Baptists of Maidstone have offered an Engagement taken before some Justices of the Peace in a solemn manner, with calling God to witness to the truth of what they say, and that they do offer to swear, and take an oath.*

Reply. Herein he hath condemned the *Judges* at *Maidstone*, either to be ignorant of an *Oath*, or else to proceed in unjust judgement against them; seeing the *Judges* required nothing of them but an *Oath*, and they offered an *Oath*, and yet they would not receive it; so that instead of condemning the prisoners because they cannot swear, he hath condemned the *Judges*, for not knowing, or at least not owning an *Oath* when it was offered them: and so contrary unto right Rule and Justice, keeping them still in prison for not *swearing*; who offered willingly to *swear* (as he saith) so that it appears that the *Judges* do no more agree with *J. Tombes's* judgement that that was an *Oath*, then the *Quakers* do; But what strange Doctrine (or rather confusion) is this in *J. Tombes*, to accuse the *Quakers* because they will not *swear*, and yet say that they do *swear* fully and plainly? And yet the *Judges*, *Mayors*, and *Magistrates* will not take it: So that by *J. Tombes's* book, and the rest that have been written for *swearing*, the *Quakers* are found guiltless, and the *Magistrates* only are to be blamed and reproved, because they will not accept of an *Oath*, when it is offered to be given by those of whom they require it.

But again secondly, If to say, *God knows*, or *God is witness*, as an appeal to Gods *consecration*, be *swearing by God*, then to say such a

man knows, or such a man is witness to the truth of what I say, as an appeal to that man's contestation, is a swearing by that man; which (*Abfit absurdum hoc nigro carbone notandum*) if these Baptists J. T. H. D. Jer. Ives; or any others shall say it is, We shall say they are not yet so wise as they will be, when they once come with the Quakers to own the truth, which they now deny.

Again, Jo. Tombes saith, That Christ is no where called the Oath of God.

Reply. In the same sense, and place, in which he is called the Covenant of God; as *Isa. 55. 5.* he is called the Oath of God; for God's Covenant is his Oath, which he swore *Luke 1. 72, 73.*

Again, J. T. saith, That there is no instance given by Sam. Fisher of any place where *ὀρκισμός* is used in a more moderate sense than to bind by Oath.

Reply. What needed one to be given by S. F. when thou gavest one thy self a viz. *1 Thess. 5. 27.* which is translated (truly enough) *I charge you by the Lord*; which is no more but *I will, require, or command you*, in God's sight, presence, or such like; which thou falsely saist is a charging or requiring one to swear by the Lord.

Or secondly, What need any more instance be given than thou hast given thy self, who confessest it over again in thy Supplement, p. 8, 9. more plainly than in thy former? confessing to thy further confutation, that these three places, viz. *1 Thess. 5. 27. 1 Tim. 6. 13. 2 Tim. 4. 1.* are alike charges, and that the word *μαρτυρία* used *1 Tim. 6. 13.* is only to command, or enjoin, and doth not include an oath, or swearing; and that the word *δραματίσθαι* used *2 Tim. 4. 1.* signifies no more than *I witness before God*; so that as it was told thee before, it is most evident, that Paul at that distance wherein he was from them when he wrote to the Thessalonians and Timothy, either did not charge them to take an Oath, or if he did, they did not take it, nor swear to him; unless we shall suppose they swore to some other that stood present as Paul's proxy, by word of mouth to exact it of them; which absurdity is more fit to be exploded than supposed.

Again, Thou sayst p. 10. That S. F. shows no instance where in with an Accusative case is a particle of affirming without swearing, and till he doth, it necessarily is a particle of swearing.

Reply. No, not necessarily; for whether with or without an accusative case, it soundeth out no more than some strong asseveration

of a thing, as with *truly*, *truly*, *indeed*, or such like; and differs little more from *ver* in Greek (with is *ya* in English) then the English *yea*, and *yea verily* do differ from each other; witness the Latine adverb *ne*, with a diphthong, derived (as is to be seen in the Latine Dictionaries) of *ver* or *vr* in the Greek, with *eta* or long *e*, which is englished no otherwise then by *truly*, *verily*, in *very deed*, or such like; and the very Accidence it self makes it a particle of affirming only, and not of swearing. And however *J. Tombes* saith, that *Grammarians* make the Greek *vr* a particle of swearing, yet the *Lexicographers* make it as well a particle of affirming only, without swearing, as in that place *1 Cor. 13*. it being evident enough, that *Paul* in that place did not swear, when he saith, *I protest by your rejoicing*, &c. for to swear by anything but God, is by all judged to be unlawful.

But *J. Tombes* replies thus: That *Paul* swears by God even in those expressions an Oath (saith he) of Oppignoration, Pawning, or Execration, wishing therein the forfeiture of his own rejoicing in Christ Jesus, if it were not so as he said; as when we say *On my salvation* it is so, &c.

Reply. If this had been an Oath of Oppignoration (as thou vainly call it) for pawning of his own part or share in Christ's joy, then he would have mentioned his own rejoicing in Christ Jesus only, and not that of the *Corinthians* also; for what reason soever he had to wish the forfeiture, or to pawn his own, yet he had neither right nor reason to wish the forfeiture of theirs, or to pawn the *Corinthians* part in the joy of Christ Jesus upon it, that it was so as he spake unto them; no more then any of us have to wish evil to another man, or to pawn other mens salvation, or to wish another man damned, in case it be not true that we speak; which is a thing altogether ungodly, unlawful, and unreasonable unto those that have the Spirit of judgement and understanding. And so *J. Tombes* his pleading for swearing from such places, is only to be judged a fruit of ignorance of Christ's Doctrine, or rather enmity against it.

But *J. Tombes* saith, that swearing is a moral commandment, and therefore lawful.

Reply. If swearing be a commandment, and a duty to be continued, as the rest of the commandments are. Then it is to be performed as a duty and command continually, without any respect to the Magistrate's imposing or requiring of it; for we are to love God with our whole heart, &c. without being required by the

Magistrate,

Magistrate, which is the first Commandment; and we are to love our neighbour as our selves, being the second, in which all the other is included; none of which respect are a command from man for the obedience of them.

But again, *J. Tombes* falls from the command, and saith: his greatest argument and inducement to swear, is, *because the denying of it hath caused; and is like to cause great persecution to those that hold the truth about Baptisme, and that they will be counted persons intakerable;* and also he saith, *that by his preaching swearing lawful, he hath saved hundreds, yea thousands (having brought them and their families by it to enjoy their liberty) from ruine.*

Reply. So that it appears it is to save people from persecution, and spoiling of their goods, and to keep their outward liberty, that *J. Tombes* hath preached up swearing, and so it seems they have the reward of their obedience to his Doctrine already; and upon this account, he, nor those that follow him, need never suffer persecution, if they will but alwayes deny the commands of Christ, as any outward power comes upon them to threaten them with suffering; so that in the day of his tryal, we have no ground otherwise to believe, but that he will deny and break any of Christ's commands, (and teach men so) rather then suffer persecution, seeing he hath thus begun with this command of Christ, *Swear not at all*, which he would make of none effect by his tradition.

Now seeing the Scripture saith, *He that breaketh the least commandment, and teach men so, he shall be least (or not at all) in the Kingdom of God;* therefore all such are to be denied, who make a trade of preaching, and when their Doctrines come to be tryed, they are found to be but the *Ministers of sin*, and to live by the sins of the people; so that all people may consider and take notice, whether this be a sufficient ground or plea, either for preaching up, or believing swearing to be lawful, because thereby they may be freed from persecution; which is the greatest hypocrisy that can be either preached or practised by those that profess to be religious. But the day is come which to some hath made, and to others is making all things manifest, and is declaring every man's work of what sort it is, that the deceivers folly may be made manifest unto all men, that from them the people may be brought into the doctrine and way of salvation, which is now freely-held forth and published by the power, and in the demonstration of the Spirit of God, as they have freely received it; not for filthy

filthy lucre, but of a ready minde; for the earth hath been sown, bred, and the land filled with such who have made a Trade of the Saints words, preaching them for filthy lucre sake, not freely, nor of a ready minde, but time-servers, having mens persons in admiration because of advantage, and for a piece of bread such men will transgress, as it is evidently manifest.

And whereas *To*, *Touber* writes himself *B. D.* yet he is read among such as are truly wise, by the name of *Blinde Divine*, rather than *Batchelor of Divinity*; who hath spent so much of his time in such vain Treatises, tending to nothing but to bring people out of the obedience to *Christ*; *De Obed.* who saith, *Swear not at all*; and having also confused himself in his own words; there needs the less be said by others to make him manifest; so for the further evidencing of the truth of those things unto people, and for ending of the Controversie between the *Quakers* of *Christ's* Doctrine, and the *Opposers* of it; we shall commend our selves, and our Testimony unto every mans Conscience in the sight of God; that his witnesses may justify the Truth, and cleare unto all men.

THE END.

